

Kateryna Karunyk

The Ukrainian Spelling Reforms, Half-Reforms, Non-Reforms and Anti-Reforms as Manifestation of the Soviet Language Policy

1. *Efforts to Regulate the Ukrainian Spelling Chaos in a Democratic Way*

Standardization of the Ukrainian language during the Soviet period passed through a number of fluctuations which had their impact on the language structure. The spelling, as one of the main elements of the language standard, equally went through deep modifications.

By the 1920s, the Ukrainians were divided between four countries (The Soviet Union, Poland, Romania and Czechoslovakia). Only in the Soviet Ukraine did the native language of the Ukrainians fulfil administrative functions, enjoying support from the state, which made it necessary to implant a language standard (cfr. Šumlians'kyj 1927: 4). Thus in 1921 the first state-supported spelling code, entitled *The Most Essential Rules of the Ukrainian Spelling*, appeared in the Soviet Ukraine (NA21a). This succinct reference guide brought various spelling habits to a common standard at least in the Soviet part of Ukraine (Nakonečnyj 1928: 3) and had a positive impact on the homogenization of the spelling habits, on the alphabetization of the masses, on the language of printed editions, etc. (Pliušč 1967: 20). The rules derived mainly from the language usage of the Eastern Ukrainians (Nakonečnyj 1928: 3; Moskalenko 1968: 34) – the so-called Eastern variety of the standard language. Nevertheless, being reprinted in the Polish part of Ukraine (NA21b, NA22a) and by the Ukrainian emigration in Germany (NA22b) and in Czechoslovakia (NA25), the 1921 spelling gained some acceptance also outside of the Soviet republic. Admittedly, these rules were not comprehensive; a number of points remained either ambiguous or contradictory (Moskalenko 1968: 35-36). Disregarding the Western Ukrainian spelling traditions, they did not encourage linguistic unity, and that was another shortcoming. The spelling variance persisted. The renowned linguist Stepan Smal'-Stoc'kyj (1859-1938) draw his colleagues' attention to this fact: “[...] unlike other civilized peoples, we do not possess yet one common spelling. Indeed, there are several of them, and more precisely – let us make a clean breast of it – there is quite a lot of chaos in the field of spelling” (Smal'-Stoc'kyj 1926: 180).

1.1. *Attempts at Latinizing the Ukrainian Script*

In the same period of time, overall language standardization, including alphabetization and spelling norms, was one of the top priorities for quite numerous peoples of the Soviet Union. For instance, a campaign for the introduction of Latin-based alphabets first in the Turkic languages and later in some other languages was initiated in the early 1920s. The Yakut and the Azerbaijan languages, which officially had adopted the Latin script by

1922, were leading the way in this respect. At the First All-Union Turcological Congress, held in February 1926, a resolution was passed which recommended the adoption of the Latin script for other Turkic languages and for the languages of culturally related peoples (Crisp 1990: 26-27). Latinization was also promoted by the Georgian-born academician Nicholas Marr (1865-1934), who advocated the idea of a future universal language based on a common graphic system. This proposal gained popularity among some Ukrainian writers (Moskalenko 1968: 9).

Three years before the All-Union Latinization campaign flourished (Moser 2016: 495), the Ukrainian writer Serhij Pylypenko (1891-1934) had made a deliberate effort to introduce the Latin script for Ukrainian. In 1923 the magazine “Červonyj Šljach” had published his *Earnest Letter to Everyone Interested in This Matter* in a Czech-style Latin transliteration.

PYLYPENKO’S SYSTEM OF TRANSLITERATION

a = a	ж = ž	н = n	х = x
б = b	з = z	о = o	ц = c
в = v	и = y	п = p	ч = č
г = h	і = i	р = r	ш = š
г = g	ї = ji	с = s	щ = šč
д = d	к = k	т = t	ю = ju
е = e	л = l	у = u	я = ja
є = je	м = m	ф = f	ь = ’

The author insisted on introducing the Latin script “either right now, or never” and explained his rationale for the former. The unification of alphabets was perceived by Pylypenko (1923: 267) as the mankind’s inevitable future challenge on its way to a common international language:

PYLYPENKO’S ORIGINAL
LATIN SCRIPT

XX storičja maje cju problemu rozvžazaty razom iz velykoju socijal’noju perebudovoju. Ljudstvo maje odnakovo pysaty, aby men’she vytračaty času na oznajomlennja z unšymy movamy. Ljudstvo maje ce zrobyty, aby spryjaty procesovi kopuljaciji mov i tvorennju jedynoji internacional’noji movy (lyše bahatoji na dijalekty terytorijal’ni j profesijni) (*ibidem*).

CYRILLIC
BACK TRANSLITERATION

XX сторіччя має цю проблему розв’язати разом із великою соціальною перебудовою. Людство має однаково писати, аби менше витратити часу на ознайомлення з іншими мовами. Людство має це зробити, аби сприяти процесові копуляції мов і творенню єдиної інтернаціональної мови (лише багатой на діалекти територіяльні й професійні).

‘The 20th century has to solve this problem in parallel with a thoroughgoing social remodelling. The mankind should write the same way to spend less time on learning foreign languages. The mankind should do this in order to promote the process of the lan-

guage copulation and the formation of a common international language (granted the diversity of territorial and professional dialects)'.

Another argument of his was the young age of the Ukrainian statehood and the lack of a comprehensive language corpus, propitious for a radical reform:

PYLYPENKO'S ORIGINAL
LATIN SCRIPT

Znov vertajučy do dylemy: 'teper čy niko-ly', majemo skonstatuvaty, ščo kožen novyj rik maje uskladnjaty spravu i ščo til'ky v najblyžči roky vona mohla b buty perevedena v žyttja bez velykyx trudnoščiv. Poky my ne majemo solidnyx velykyx naukovyx prac', poky v sferi pidručnykiv обмежуємося головним чыном початковою школою i til'ky dumajemo pro profesijnu, poky til'ky zasivajet'sja lan novoho radjans'koho pys'menstva – ce zrobyty ne tak važko (*Ibid.*: 268).

CYRILLIC
BACK TRANSLITERATION

Знов вертаючи до дилеми: 'тепер чи ніколи', маємо сконстатувати, що кожен новий рік має ускладняти справу і що тільки в найближчі роки вона могла б бути переведена в життя без великих труднощів. Поки ми не маємо солідних великих наукових праць, поки в сфері підручників обмежуємося головним чыном початковою школою і тільки думаємо про професійну, поки тільки засівається лан нового радянського письменства – це зробити не так важко.

'Readdressing the dilemma of 'either right now or never', we must recognize that with every passing year the thing will become more and more difficult and that it only would be possible to carry it out without serious complications in the next few years. As long as we have no substantial, voluminous scholarly works, as long as we, concerning the textbooks, mainly limit ourselves to the elementary school and just contemplate producing them for the vocational education, as long as the field of new Soviet literature is merely in course of being seeded, it is not so very difficult to achieve this.'

In the end of his appeal the writer pointed up the practical easiness of the Latin script. Yet he did not insist on the exclusive correctness of his own system of transliteration.

PYLYPENKO'S ORIGINAL
LATIN SCRIPT

P.S. Pyšu cijegu transkrypcijegu, zovsim ne propagujučy imenno jiji, ale ščob pokazaty, jak lahko, navit' bez nijakoji zvyčky, rozbyratysja v nij, a, značyt', na razі potreby – j nazavše do čohoś podibnoho perejty (*ibidem*).

CYRILLIC
BACK TRANSLITERATION

P.S. Пишу цією транскрипцією, зовсім не пропагуючи іменно її, але щоб показати, як легко, навіть без ніякої звички, розбиратися в ній, а, значить, на разі потреби – й назавше до чогоś подібного перейти.

'While using my transcription, I am by no means pushing for precisely this one, but trying to show how easy it is, even without any practice, to grasp it, and, therefore, if necessary, to adopt for all time something of the kind'.

In a short time two more proponents of the Latin script expressed their approval of Pylypenko's initiative in the same magazine, albeit voicing a few remarks about his transliteration. The linguist and writer Mychajlo Johansen (1895-1937) seemingly agreed on the whole with Pylypenko's system of rendering the Ukrainian letters while criticizing only some weak points in it. The combination of consonants with iotized vowels was one of his targets: since Pylypenko introduced the apostrophe (') to indicate the palatalization of consonants, there was no need to assign the same function to ⟨j⟩, like in the word *vidbuknet'sja* (Johansen 1923: 167).

We have to abandon such a legacy of our school 'curriculum' as soon as possible. First, there is no difference in pronunciation of the palatalized consonants in both instances. Second, to put it the other way round, we do use ⟨j⟩ as a symbol of iotization, and thus palatalization and iotization are confused in the spelling. So it seems that ⟨j⟩ should be kept for iotization and (') for palatalization, as they are used in the scholarly transcription (*ibidem*).

In order to avoid combinations of two consonants accompanied with apostrophe, Johansen (1923: 167-168) suggested that the latter be put after a group of such consonants, e.g., *poLS'kyj* (cfr. *польський* 'Polish') like *paNS'kyj* (cfr. *панський* 'landlord's'), and, accordingly, *vidbuknetS'a* (cfr. *відгукнется* 'he / she will respond'). Inasmuch as the Ukrainians pronounced *l* in many words as an alveolar lateral approximant (similar to the one typical of Central European languages), the author found it unnecessary to indicate the palatalization of ⟨l⟩ in such cases, therefore he proposed to write *fLota* (cfr. *флота* 'fleet' then in force), *Lohika* (cfr. *логіка* 'logic' then in force), as well as *centralnyj* (cfr. *центральный* 'central') and *tiLky* (cfr. *тільки* 'only'). Yet some Ukrainian words, according to his system, had to be written with an apostrophe to symbolize the real palatalization of /l/: "But we shall write *l'ubl'u* ['I love' – К.К.] with palatalization, which we hear in pronunciation, as well as *stavlat'* ['they put' – К.К.] etc." (Johansen 1923: 168).

Johansen put forward one more amendment to Pylypenko's transcription: instead of rendering the Cyrillic letters ⟨и⟩ and ⟨е⟩ with ⟨y⟩ and ⟨e⟩ respectively, he proposed to distinguish between the stressed /y/, marked as ⟨ê⟩, and the unstressed /e/ and /y/, indiscriminately symbolized by the grapheme ⟨e⟩. Surprisingly, he said nothing about the stressed /e/, while his instance of a Latinized Ukrainian text displays an inconsistency in this respect, cfr.: *prekmêtneke* vs. *прикмѣтники* 'adjectives', *protelêžne* vs. *протиѣжне* 'opposite', but *serEdn'ij* vs. *серѣдній* 'middle', *serEdene* vs. *серѣдини* 'Gen. for the middle of', *před* vs. *нѣред* 'before', *popředn'oho* vs. *попереднього* 'Gen. for preliminary', *projéct* vs. *проѣкт* 'project', *lehén'ke* vs. *легѣньке* 'slight', *dejaket* vs. *дѣяким* 'Dat. for some' (two words are spelled with ⟨ê⟩, the same way as for the stressed /y/, while the grapheme ⟨e⟩

¹ In Ukrainian unstressed /y/ and /e/ sound like [y^c] and [e^c] respectively, hardly distinguishable by ear. Johansen treated these allophones as an instance of complete phonological neutralization.

stands for both stressed and unstressed /e/ in all the other cases). Be it as it may, Johansen (1923: 168) stood firm: the sign ⟨ê⟩ is necessary and its functions can be easily grasped just by reading aloud a small fragment of a Ukrainian text thus spelt:

Takêj v korotkex rêsax projekt sproščenoho pravopesu, ščo mê proponujemo do vžêtku. Lehen'ke počutt'a nezvêklostë do znaku ê znekaje, pročetaťvše vholos xoč be j c'oho lesta. Z dejakem zdevuvann'am četač pomitet' naskilke ce označenn'a točno vidpovidaje joho vlasnij vemovi (kole v joho dobra vemova, scilicet!).

'This is a brief outline of the project of a simplified spelling which we propose to employ. A slight feeling of oddity one might have about the sign ⟨ê⟩ is dispelled by just reading aloud something of the kind of this message of mine. With a certain surprise the reader will notice how precisely this symbolization corresponds to his own pronunciation (provided he has a good one, scilicet!).'

Johansen's proposal went thus much deeper than Pylypenko's: instead of transliteration he was campaigning in favour of phonetization of the Ukrainian spelling based on a new Latin alphabet. However, his distinction of stressed and unstressed /e/ and /y/ did not meet with approval from another champion of the Latin alphabet, the Galician Ivan Tkačuk (1891-1948), who would rather stick to Pylypenko's simpler rendering of ⟨e⟩ and ⟨u⟩. All the other points, like the use of apostrophe, Czech letters and iotized letters, were, according to him, subject to discussion (Tkačuk 1924: 247). Still, the very issue of shifting from the Cyrillic to the Latin script, as Tkačuk stressed, was urgent and overdue (*ibid.*: 246).

After a State Spelling Committee was appointed by the Council of the People's Commissars of the Ukrainian Soviet Republic in July 1925, it formed a subgroup responsible for the choice of alphabet. By the end of the year, this subgroup came to the conclusion that a radical alphabet reform, i.e., Latinization, was ill-timed (Syniavs'kyj 1931: 97). Both Pylypenko and Johansen were members of the Spelling Committee, and they made another motion concerning the adoption of a Latin script at the All-Ukrainian Spelling Conference of 1927², but it was only backed by a minority of the participants: three according to Syniavs'kyj (1931: 102), fifteen according to Moser (2016: 496) and twenty according to Simovyč (2005: 69). The idea of Latinizing the Ukrainian writing system was thus buried for good.

1.2. *In Pursuit of a Compromise All-Ukrainian Spelling*

The decision to establish an official state committee with an eye to improving the spelling was prompted by the general feeling, very widespread by the mid-1920s, that the 1921 rules were no longer sufficient, and that there was "an imperative need to amplify and

² A ten-days long All-Ukrainian Spelling Conference was held in Charkiv in May and June 1927 (Syniavs'kyj 1931: 101). This meeting – its purpose being to reach unity in spelling for all the Ukrainian lands – was attended, apart from Soviet participants, by linguists from the Western part of Ukraine: Simovyč, Kyrylo Studyns'kyj (1868-1941) and Ilarion Sviencic'kyj (1876-1956) (*ibidem*, cfr. Nakonečnyj 1928: 4-5).

disambiguate” the norms in force (Nakonečnyj 1928: 3). The committee was comprised of professional linguists, writers, editors and teachers (UPP26: 3); the West Ukrainian scholars S. Smal'-Stoc'kyj, Volodymyr Hnatiuk (1871-1926) and Vasyľ Simovyč (1880-1944) were invited to join it in order to incorporate also the Western writing and speaking practice (Nakonečnyj 1928: 3; cfr. Syniavs'kyj 1931: 100).

It was Oleksa Syniavs'kyj (1887-1937), probably the most influential member of the committee, who edited a draft of a new emended and supplemented Ukrainian spelling (UPP26), published in April 1926 in 2,000 copies and distributed both in and outside the Soviet Ukraine, generating a lively discussion in the press.

One of the main tendencies consisted in propounding further phonetization of the Ukrainian spelling. Already in 1925, when the state committee was starting its work, the renowned linguist Jevhen Tymčenko (1866-1948) indicated several deficiencies in the Ukrainian writing system and suggested some steps to make it more consistent. He advanced three precepts to be applied in the spelling reform: each sound (phoneme) must have a separate letter in the alphabet; the spelling must base on the phonetic principle; loanwords and foreign proper names must preserve their original pronunciation when rendered by means of the Ukrainian script (Tymčenko 1925: 188). In particular, the scholar proposed to borrow symbols from the international transcription to designate the Ukrainian affricates /dʒ/, /dʒʲ/ and to substitute the Cyrillic letter ⟨й⟩ by the Latin ⟨j⟩. He treated the letters ⟨ш⟩, ⟨я⟩, ⟨ю⟩, ⟨є⟩, ⟨ї⟩ and ⟨ь⟩ as superfluous: ⟨ш⟩ indicated two sounds /ʃ/ and /ʃʲ/, each of them having its own letter in the alphabet; the iotized vowel symbols can be replaced with ⟨j⟩ + non-iotized vowel symbol. Tymčenko also envisioned the abolition of the palatalization mark ⟨ь⟩, because it does not designate any sound – but his proposals as to the possible alternatives were not quite consistent (Tymčenko 1925: 189-190).

In 1926, Petro Savyc'kyj (??-after 1934), a teacher from the Western Ukraine, while pinpointing the same imperfections in the Ukrainian alphabet, came up with six amendments to improve it. What he regarded as a viable solution included:

1. establishing an alphabet of 38 letters, equal to the number of sounds used in the language;
2. abolishing the symbols for iotized vowels and retaining only the letters ⟨a⟩, ⟨e⟩, ⟨u⟩, ⟨i⟩, ⟨o⟩, ⟨y⟩;
3. preserving the existing 20 letters for non-palatalized consonants: ⟨б⟩, ⟨в⟩, ⟨г⟩, ⟨ґ⟩, ⟨д⟩, ⟨ж⟩, ⟨з⟩, ⟨к⟩, ⟨л⟩, ⟨м⟩, ⟨н⟩, ⟨п⟩, ⟨р⟩, ⟨с⟩, ⟨т⟩, ⟨ф⟩, ⟨х⟩, ⟨ч⟩, ⟨ц⟩, ⟨ш⟩;
4. introducing the special symbols ⟨g⟩ and ⟨ʒc⟩ for the affricates /dʒ/ and /dʒʲ/ respectively (instead of the previously used digraphs ⟨дз⟩ and ⟨дж⟩);
5. employing ⟨шч⟩ (as pronounced) instead of the traditional letter ⟨ш⟩;
6. eliminating the palatalization mark ⟨ь⟩ and introducing 10 symbols for palatalized consonants: ⟨á⟩, ⟨áʲ⟩, ⟨á̂⟩, ⟨á̂ʲ⟩, ⟨á̃⟩, ⟨á̃ʲ⟩, ⟨á̄⟩, ⟨á̄ʲ⟩, ⟨á̅⟩, ⟨á̅ʲ⟩ (instead of ⟨аь⟩, ⟨эь⟩, ⟨аь̂⟩, ⟨нь̂⟩, ⟨рь̂⟩, ⟨сь̂⟩, ⟨ть̂⟩, ⟨ць̂⟩, ⟨дзь̂⟩ and ⟨й̂⟩ respectively) (Savyc'kyj 1926: 180-181).

Half of Savyc'kyj's corrections (nos. 2, 4, 5) coincided on the whole with Tymčenko's suggestions, even if the symbols he proposed for /ɕ/ and /ɕʲ/ were dissimilar. In particular, Savyc'kyj's proposal of differentiating between palatalized and non-palatalized consonants was quite explicit and functional. His system would produce a graphic expression for Ukrainian of the following kind:

Історія літератури та історія соціялна је лише двома боками јединого процесу: боротьби зі стихійними силами природи лудського суспільства, поділеного на класи. Настрої, ідеї, засоби художньої творчости певної доби залежаѣ від досягнутої в цю добу височини технічної та економічної култури і мінајуѣса разом зі змінюју форми виробництва – економічного фактора і класової боротьби, шчо виникає на ґрунті розподілу матеріялних дібр і знаходит' відгук у творах мистецтва, котре је в умовах класового суспільства знарјададам боротьби і відбиває ідеологіју пануючої в певну добу суспільної верстви (Savyc'kyj 1926: 181).

As can be observed, Savyc'kyj's sample text contains two words spelt at variance with his own declared principles: *досягнутої* 'of the achieved' and *знарјададам* 'by tool', (one would expect *дослягнутої* and *знар'ададам* instead). It may be presumed, however, that these instances reflect the author's authentic pronunciation. Namely, the Western Ukrainians mostly pronounce, e.g., *буряк* 'beet-root' as [bu'ɾjak] and *рясний* 'abundant' as [ɾjas'nyj]. S. Smal'-Stoc'kyj (1926: 188) actually claimed that a Ukrainian is unable to read ⟨ря⟩ otherwise than [ɾja]. This is why the Western Ukrainians staunchly refused to use an apostrophe after the symbols for labials and after ⟨p⟩ to indicate the non-palatalized pronunciation of these consonants (Karpova 1960: 135-136). When the question of whether to preserve the apostrophe in the Ukrainian script was debated at the Spelling Conference, a great majority of participants voted at first against it; nonetheless the final decision was in its favour, though with certain restrictions (Syniavs'kyj 1931: 108).

The proposed revisions of the – basically Cyrillic – Ukrainian alphabet were another matter of discussion at the 1927 conference: votes were taken on the replacement of the letter ⟨й⟩ by ⟨j⟩, on the entire or partial elimination of the letters ⟨я⟩, ⟨ю⟩, ⟨є⟩, ⟨ї⟩, on the abolishment of the letter ⟨r⟩, on introducing special symbols for the alveolar /l/, bilabial /w/, affricates /ɕʲ/ and /ɕ/ etc. None of these motions gained support, so that the Cyrillic script and the writing system remained virtually unchanged (Syniavs'kyj 1931: 103).

Another heated discussion concerned the spelling of loanwords and of foreign proper names. The Eastern Ukrainian intellectuals, who had learnt Russian at school, and were used to the Russian ways of pronunciation and spelling, had a non-palatalized pronunciation of the foreign ⟨l⟩ (*класа* 'class', *декламация* 'declamation', *Ла-Маниш*, 'La Manche'), yet in some loanwords their /l/ underwent palatalization (*пляж* 'beach', *молюск* 'mollusc') – if that was the case also in Russian; Ukrainians in the West, influenced by the Polish and the German linguistic traditions, typically pronounced the same loanwords with a palatalized /l/: *кляса*, *деклямація*, *Ля-Маниш*, *пляж*, *молюск* (Nakonečnyj 1928: 12; cfr. Syniavs'kyj 1931: 104-105). The 1921 spelling rules recommended to render foreign ⟨g⟩

and ⟨h⟩ with the Ukrainian ⟨r⟩ (plosive /g/) and ⟨r⟩ (fricative /fi/) respectively only in proper names, while common names had to be spelt invariably with ⟨r⟩: *Гуго* ‘Hugo’, but *Генерал* ‘general’ (НА21а: 12). The Western Ukrainians practised this distinction both in proper names and in common loanwords. The distinguished Ukrainian historian Mychajlo Hruševs’kyj (1866-1934) commended the so-called Galician spelling tradition and sharply criticized those Ukrainians who were accustomed to the Russian way of spelling:

What distinguished the Ukrainian orthography from the Russian one was labelled as ‘Galician barbarism’, to be eradicated, crushed and forgotten as soon as possible, in order not to offend the ‘Little-Russian’ eye. In truth, it has been purified to the extent that the Ukrainians are now breaking their tongues to ape the Great-Russian pronunciation, prompted by the orthography, thus obliterating the difference between the Ukrainian and the Russian languages (Hruševs’kyj 1925: 189).

At the Spelling Conference the participants could not reach a consensus on the rendition of the foreign ⟨l⟩ and ⟨g⟩: 22 votes went in favour of the palatalization of the former and 20 against; the letter ⟨r⟩ obtained a better result, with 26 votes ‘for’ and 10 ‘against’ (Syniavs’kyj 1931: 105). Finally, the Spelling Conference came to a certain compromise on these and other divergences (*ibid.*: 105-106]). Non-palatalized /l/ and fricative /fi/ (spelt ⟨r⟩) were to be used in words of Greek origin, palatalized /l/ and plosive /g/ (spelt ⟨r⟩) in those borrowed from other European languages (with some exceptions). The Committee’s presidium unanimously approved this admittedly “artificial” formula (*ibid.*: 107). On the 6th of September 1928 the People’s Commissar of Education Mykola Skrypnyk (1872-1933) signed the new Ukrainian Spelling Rules, which thus gained the status of official norm (УР28: 1). Discussed and approved in a totally democratic way, this spelling appeared as a real, albeit moderate, reform, which fulfilled its key aim of reconciling the speaking and writing habits of both Easterners and Westerners (cfr. Moskalenko 1968: 41).

2. *Convergence with Russian*

When the Soviet authorities assumed an oppressive attitude towards non-Russian peoples at the turn the 1930s, Volodymyr Zaton’skyj (1888-1938), having supplanted Skrypnyk in the People’s Commissariat of Education, appointed on the 6th of April 1933 a special committee “to inspect the work done on the language front” (Vakulenko 2009: 75). This inspection condemned the 1928 spelling as “bourgeois nationalist” and pro-Polish (УР33: 5; Smal’Stoc’kyj 1936: 172). What had been treated as a balanced solution acceptable to all Ukrainians came to be interpreted as an attempt to tear Ukrainian away from Russian. The anti-reform of 1933 brought the Ukrainian spelling in many aspects as close as possible to the Russian one. As George Y. Shevelov (1908-2002; 1994: 5) put it: “Particularly the components of Middle European origin absorbed by Ukrainian when the country belonged, though marginally, to the Middle European community (Sprachbund) were to be eradicated mercilessly”. As a result, the letter ⟨r⟩ was banned outright from the Ukrainian alphabet, and this caused a serious

alteration in the phonemic system, as neither loanwords nor native Ukrainian words were any longer spelt, and later even pronounced, with the plosive /g/. The new rendering of the foreign ⟨g⟩ and ⟨h⟩ with Ukrainian ⟨r⟩ and ⟨x⟩ respectively duplicated the Russian pattern, and the same happened to the foreign /l/ (УР33: 60) and to the German diphthong /ai/ (*ibid.*: 63). The gender of numerous loanwords changed from feminine to masculine, again in order to comply with the Russian usage. Some foreign proper names were remodelled on the Russian forms. The new rules introduced a hiatus, alien to Ukrainian, in many words of foreign origin (*ibid.*: 21, 61-62). In grammar, the new spelling rules established the form of present participle in *-аючий* (*-уючий*) as normative (*ibid.*: 59).

SPELLING CHANGE	1928	1933	TRANSLATION
r → r (foreign g)	ґрунт	ґрунт	foundation
	лінґвістика	лінґвістика	linguistics
	аґресор	аґресор	aggressor
ля, льо, лю → ла, ло, лу	балаєст	балаєст	ballast
	блоєк	блоєк	block
	целюльоїд	целулоїд	celluloid
ай → ей (Germ. <i>ei</i>)	Ляйпціґ	Лейпціґ	Leipzig
	наївний	наївний	naïve
<i>hiatus:</i> аї, ає, ія, іє, ію, оє, ої → ai, ae, ia, ie, iy, oe, oi	траєкторія	траєкторія	trajectory
	соціалізм	соціалізм	socialism
	клієнт	клієнт	client
	тріумф	тріумф	triumph
	проєкт	проект	project
	целюльоїд	целулоїд	celluloid
loanwords <i>f.</i> → <i>m.</i>	<i>f.</i> генéза	<i>m.</i> гéнезис	genesis
	<i>f.</i> метóда	<i>m.</i> мéтод	method
Present participle in <i>-аючий</i> (<i>-уючий</i>)	–	бажаючий	the willing
	–	виростаючий	the growing
	–	конкуруючий	the competing

These spelling changes reflect new principles, opposed to the former ones, and programmatically aimed at: 1) withdrawal of ‘artificial barriers’ between the Ukrainian and Russian languages; 2) abolishment of archaisms, parallelisms and provincialisms; 3) simplification of the rules; 4) total revision of “incorrect and politically harmful sections on spelling of ‘loanwords’ and proper names” (Chvylja 1933: 41). In the Soviet Ukraine, the 1933 spelling rules were reprinted in 1934 and 1936 with some minor corrections (УР34; УР36). The Western Ukrainians (in Poland, Czechoslovakia and Romania) did not accept the Soviet anti-reform, sticking instead to the previous rules (Nimčuk 1991: 17).

In 1937, the mastermind behind the 1933 spelling Andrij Chvylja (Oliner; 1898-1938) and his assistants, having been accused in their turn of the bourgeois nationalist bias, were swept away by another wave of Stalin's repressions. The Ukrainian press immediately launched an attack against Chvylja's spelling (Shevelov 1989: 166). Complaints were voiced that it was inconsistent and insufficient:

In order to make the understanding of the rules more difficult, the spelling advanced antiscientific statements, there were discrepancies between its several sections, finally, more complicated spelling issues were eschewed or formulated quite inadequately (Bez-krovnyj *et al.* 1938: 46).

Although the anti-reform of 1933 had brought the Ukrainian spelling system and some grammatical forms closer to Russian, even this was seen as not quite satisfactory (cfr. *Pidsumky*: 102, 105; Nakonečnyj 1939: 86-89). Moreover, the Russian linguists were preparing in the mid-1930s a new spelling for Russian, which necessitated further alterations in Ukrainian (Moskalenko 1968: 44). On the other hand, the 1933 rules clashed with the internal structure of the Ukrainian language and with actual language usage (Kyryčenko 1947: 4). Hence they required further revision.

Since January 1938 the press was discussing possible changes to the Ukrainian spelling. On the 14th of May 1938 the Ukrainian Council of Peoples' Commissars appointed an official spelling committee consisting of seven members – linguists, editors and teachers (UPP38: 3; Jefimenko 2002: 184). The committee's key task was "to eliminate nationalist distortions and correct mistakes" in the spelling rules (UPP38: 3), taking into account criticism and recommendations expressed in the press. In other words, it had to bring them closer to the everyday speech of the Ukrainian proletarians and to simplify some Ukrainian grammatical forms by duplicating the Russian ones (*Pidsumky*: 102; Kyryčenko 1947: 4-5).

The leading role in this process belonged to the linguist Mykola Hrun's'kyj (1872-1951), the editor of all the draft projects issued by the spelling committee. It is surprising that neither the committee's work, nor the spelling projects produced by it have ever been thoroughly investigated. Some scholars mention the spelling project of 1938 (Rusaniv's'kyj 1967: 139) or of 1940 (Levčenko 1946: 193; Moskalenko 1968: 26, 44) or both (Nimčuk 2002: 24-25). In his historical outline of the Soviet Ukrainian linguistics Mychajlo Žovtoibrjuch (1905-1995; 1991: 206) wrote about two editions, published in the end of 1938 and in the end of 1939 respectively. Petro Tymošenko (1920-1984; 1967:4) tentatively mentioned four editions of Hrun's'kyj's spelling project. In reality, during the years 1938 to 1940 the committee submitted no less than five versions of the amended spelling rules. The first one (UPP38) appeared in 1938 (in 350 copies) and was even reviewed in the press (Bez-krovnyj *et al.* 1938). Three more drafts with the same print run bear the year 1939 on the front pages (UPP39.1; UPP39.2; UPP39.3). In 1940, the committee printed 50 copies of its last draft (UPP40), which was approvingly evaluated in two reviews (Pelipas 1940; Zahrods'kyj 1941).

This planned reform did imply changes in the very grammatical structure of Standard Ukrainian. In addition to the two existing Ukrainian superlative forms, i.e. **НАЙбільший**

‘the biggest’, *НАЙкращий* ‘the best’ and *НАЙБІЛЬШ зручний* ‘the most convenient’, all the five drafts proposed to establish a Russian-like one of the type *САМИЙ більший* ‘the biggest’, *САМИЙ кращий* ‘the best’, *САМИЙ зручний* ‘the most convenient’ (UPP38: 65; UPP39.1: 68; UPP39.2: 68; UPP39.3: 68; UPP40: 71). Furthermore, Genitive, Dative and Locative cases of the numerals from 50 to 80, as well as their ordinal forms were adjusted to the Russian declensional and derivational models: *ШЕСТИдесяти* (cfr. Russian *ШЕСТИдесяти*) instead of proper Ukrainian *ШИСТдесяти* ‘Gen., Dat. and Loc. for sixty’; *ШЕСТИдесятий*, *СЕМИдесятий* (cfr. Russian *ШЕСТИдесятий*, *СЕМИдесятий*) instead of proper Ukrainian *ШИСТдесятий*, *СИМдесятий* ‘the sixtieth, the seventieth’ (UPP38: 67-68; UPP39.1: 70; UPP39.2: 70; UPP39.3: 70; UPP40: 73). The active past participle in *-ший*, borrowed from Russian, was illustrated with one single word *перемігШИЙ* ‘having won’ in 1938 (UPP38: 77), but next year two more examples – *бувШИЙ* ‘having been’ and *спалахнувШИЙ* ‘having flashed’ – were added (UPP39.1: 81; UPP39.2: 80; UPP39.3: 81; UPP40: 84). A further portion of loanwords changed their gender from feminine to masculine: f. *теза* → m. *тезис* ‘thesis’, f. *криза* → m. *кризис* ‘crisis’, f. *синтакса* → m. *синтаксис* ‘syntax’, etc. (UPP38: 84; UPP39.1: 89; UPP39.2: 88; UPP39.3: 89; UPP40: 92).

At the same time, the draft projects reflected a sort of indecisiveness with respect to loanwords. E.g. the hiatus was to be avoided in some instances: the first draft of 1939 proposed to revert to *героїчний* ‘heroic’, *наївний* ‘naïve’, *прозаїк* ‘prose-writer’, *клієнт* ‘client’, *пацієнт* ‘patient’, but *дієта* ‘diet’ was to keep its hiatus (UPP39.1: 85-87). The second version contained parallel forms *клієнт* and *клиєнт* (UPP39.2: 85, 87), as well as *пацієнт*, but upheld *плетет* ‘piety’ (*ibidem*). The third version of 1939 was identical with the first one, but for *дієта* which was skipped (UPP39.3: 85, 87). The draft of 1940 included three more loanwords with epenthetic /j/: *проект* ‘project’, *проекція* ‘projection’, *траєкторія* ‘trajectory’ (UPP40: 90). This slight modification was, presumably, a side-effect of the incorporation of the Western Ukrainian lands (Galicia, Volhynia and Bucovina) into the Soviet Union in 1939-1940 (Shevelov 1989: 170; Šerech 1952, 16: 8). One of Hrunc’kyj’s assistants remarked that “the reunification with the Ukrainian people of the Western regions and of the Northern Bucovina [...] sets new tasks for the Ukrainian spelling” (Pelipas 1940: 45). Simovyč (2005: 214) also admitted that after Galicia’s integration, the Western Ukrainians became gladly received. This created a situation in which some writers even dared to disapprove of the official course in the Soviet Ukrainian spelling (*ibidem*).

Though none of these five drafts was officially approved, the Ukrainian press was willing to implement the new spelling rules without delay (Zahrods’kyj 1941: 119; Bulachovs’kyj 1945: 20; Il’jin 1946: 4; Levčenko 1946: 193; Kyryčenko 1947: 7-8). This caused a state of “language anarchy” which was “made use of to further Russify the Ukrainian language” (Šerech 1952, 16: 7). New grammar books, based on the spelling project of 1938, appeared immediately (Žovtobrjuch 1939). This effort to bring the Ukrainian spelling and grammar structure still closer to Russian may be regarded as a continuation of the previous anti-reform. Thus the 1930s in the history of the Ukrainian spelling were the years of the sharpest turn toward Russification. Eventually the spelling project of 1940 was abandoned; Hrunc’kyj’s spelling committee had to stop their work because of the German occupation of Ukraine.

While the Soviet institutions were evacuated to the Eastern regions of the European Russia and functioned there in 1941-1944, the Ukrainians who found themselves under German rule chose to stick to the 1928 orthography. By January 1942, scholarly institutions in Kyjiv and in Lviv, having acknowledged that the official Ukrainian Bolshevik spelling did not reflect the Ukrainian language laws, but rather mirrored the Russian spelling, agreed to restore the unifying Ukrainian norms of 1928 (Simovyč 2005: 214). Numerous Ukrainian periodicals published in 1941-1944 adhered basically to these rules.

Concurrently the evacuated Ukrainian linguists were revising again the official spelling. In June 1942 the Ukrainian Government appointed a new spelling committee headed by the academician Leonid Bulachov's'kij (1888-1961) (Onyščenko *et al.* 2007: 55). The committee had to lean on the work of their pre-war predecessors and to take account of the Russian spelling project of 1940 (*ibid.*: 65). In April 1943 Bulachov's'kyj presented a draft which, despite adhering to the official requirements, tried to maintain some essential features of Ukrainian. For instance, it ventured to re-establish the letter ⟨r⟩ at least in such Ukrainian words as *гав* 'crow', *гедзь* 'gadfly', *гудзик* 'button', *ремигати* 'ruminant' etc., but later, "under pressure of political circumstances," Bulachov's'kyj changed his mind (Bojačuk 1989: 19). The new spelling could be approved in August 1943, when a meeting of the spelling committee was attended by the Head of the Council of the People's Commissars of the Ukrainian SSR Nikita Chruščev (1894-1971) and other leaders of the Ukrainian Communist Party. However, there were a few details, like the spelling of Russian surnames, the letter ⟨r⟩ etc., on which a compromise could not be reached (Bulachov's'kyj 1945: 20). The People's Commissar of Education, Pavlo Tyčyna (1891-1967), refused to sign a new orthographic code without the letter ⟨r⟩. Only after having been informed about Josef Stalin's (1878-1953) "direct instruction" concerning the inadmissibility of the letter ⟨r⟩ (Tel'niuk 1989: 4) did he endorse the new spelling rules on the 8th of May 1945 (UP45: 4). Approved and printed in 1945, the orthography was put into practice enforced since 1946.

These spelling rules followed the draft of 1940 with regard to vowel hiatus resolution, except for the word *project* (UP45: 104-106); a few more feminine nouns moved from to the masculine gender (*ibid.*: 109), etc.:

SPELLING CHANGE	1933	1945	TRANSLATION
<i>hiatus filling:</i> ai, ae, ie, oi → ai̯, ae̯, ie̯, oi̯, but: ia, iy, oe	НАІВНИЙ ТРАЕКТОРІЯ КЛІЄНТ ЦЕЛУЛОІД СОЦІАЛІЗМ ТРІУМФ ПРОЕКТ	НАЇВНИЙ ТРАЄКТОРІЯ КЛІЄНТ ЦЕЛУЛОЇД СОЦІАЛІЗМ ТРІУМФ ПРОЕКТ	naïve trajectory client celluloid socialism triumph project
loanwords <i>f.</i> → <i>m.</i> or <i>f.</i> + <i>m.</i>	<i>f.</i> СИНТА́КСА <i>f.</i> оаза <i>f.</i> тезА	<i>m.</i> СІНТАКСИС <i>m.</i> оазИС <i>f.</i> тезА and <i>m.</i> тезИС	syntax oasis thesis

Bulachovs'kyj's committee declined most morphological alterations proposed in the preceding projects of 1938-1940, although it partially accepted some suggestions concerning word-building, e.g.: *двоохсотий* (cfr. *двосотий* 'the two-hundredth')³, *двохосьовий* (cfr. *двоосьовий* 'bi-axial') vs. *двометровий* 'two metres high'⁴ (*ibid.*: 87, 30). Curiously, Bulachovs'kyj (1945: 21) did not consider the spelling rules of 1945 as a reform, but only as an adjustment of the 1933 spelling, while a colleague of his claimed that the spelling had been "fundamentally reformed" (Levčenko 1946: 193). The preface to the 1945 spelling rules specified 8 principles which were basic for this edition (УР45: 4). The first three points declared an intention to combine the received tradition, the living usage and the language of the best Ukrainian writers. These maxims made it possible to reach a quasi-compromise between the spelling rules of 1928 and 1933, which can be called a 'half-reform'.

3. Convergence with Russian vs. Reinstatement of the Older Spelling Practice

In 1956, an amended version of Russian spelling rules came out (ПРОП), prompting another revision of the Ukrainian spelling (*Pro perevydannia*: 7; Varčenko 1959: 2). A new edition of the Ukrainian spelling rules appeared in 1960. The changes were rather random: the spelling of the hyphenated nouns and adjectives repeated the Russian rules, e.g. *ясно-червоний* 'bright red', *кисло-солодкий* 'bitter sweet', *пів-яблука* 'half an apple', *пів-аркуша* 'half a page' (УР60: 36); in a few nouns the suffix *-овк(a)*⁵ changed back into *-івк(a)/-ївк(a)*: *спиртІВКА* 'spirit-lamp', *маїВКА* 'spring-time outing' (*ibid.*: 32); some proper names, like *ІєННА* 'Jena', *ГаванНА* 'Havana', since 1960 were to be spelt without gemination in the root: *ІєНА*, *ГаванНА* (*ibid.*: 117, 115).

In summer 1962 the editorial board of the Moscow-based journal "Russkijazyk v škole" urged its readers "to engage in a discussion of spelling issues" (*Ot redakcii*). For two years the journal was publishing under the heading *Spelling Problems* various proposals as to how to improve the spelling and the graphic system of Russian. Very soon (in December 1962) the newspaper "Radians'ka osvita" published an open letter by seven teachers from the provincial town of Uman', addressed to the Institute of Linguistics in Kiev, with an appeal for an "integral streamlining of the Ukrainian spelling rules"

³ Three drafts of Hrun's'kyj's spelling projects proposed the forms like *двоохсотий* (УРР39.1: 71; УРР39.3: 71; УРР40: 74); two more editions contained a form *двосотий* (УРР38: 68; УРР39.2: 71).

⁴ Since 1939 Hrun's'kyj's projects persistently gave the form *двохметровий* (УРР39.1: 24; УРР39.2: 25; УРР39.3: 24; УРР40: 24), while the draft of 1938 prescribed solely *двометровий* (УРР38: 24).

⁵ Although the spelling regulations of the 1920s-1930s did not include this rule at all, the suffix *-овк(a)* started prevailing over *-івк(a)* since about mid-1930s. Hrun's'kyj's projects suggested exclusively the suffix *-овк(a)*, e.g., *майОВКА* 'spring-time outing', *нотьОВКА* 'card of admission', *спиртОВКА* 'spirit-lamp', *формулірОВКА* 'formulation' (УРР38: 22; УРР39.1: 23; УРР39.2: 23; УРР39.3: 23; УРР40: 23). Bulachovs'kyj preserved this model with an exception for *нутІВКА* (УР45: 28).

(Vološčuk *et al.* 1962: 1). Further messages with similar suggestions, in line with the position of the Uman' teachers, appeared in the following issues of the same newspaper (*Liubytz*; Kulyk 1962). The Ukrainian periodicals for teachers encouraged the readers to express their opinion concerning the overcomplicated and imperfect Ukrainian orthography (cfr. Moskalenko 1968: 28-29).

In January 1963, yet another spelling committee, this time headed by Vitalij Rusaniv's'kyj (1931-2007) set about simplifying the Ukrainian spelling (Andruščenko 1963: 3; Kovalenko 1963: 3). Linguists and teachers were coming up with their arguments and propositions as to how to amend and streamline the spelling rules then in force, which were, admittedly, a hindrance to mastering the Ukrainian language (Vološčuk *et al.* 1962: 1). School teachers, who expressed their attitudes mainly in newspaper publications, often claimed that the Ukrainian spelling was causing difficulties because of its divergence from the Russian one and pressed for their harmonization (*Hramotnist'*: 1). By contrast, university teachers and professional linguists articulated their views in the journal "Ukrajins'ka mova i literatura v školi". Some authors suggested to transcribe the German diphthongs /ai/, /oi/ according to their original pronunciation instead of /ej/, as in Russian (Kobyljans'kyj 1964: 76; Stril'civ 1963: 69), and to render the foreign ⟨i⟩ after dental consonants with the Ukrainian ⟨и⟩, e.g. *Алжир* 'Algeria', *Мадрид* 'Madrid', *Сицилія* 'Sicilia' instead of *Алжир*, *Мадрид*, *Сицилія* (Doboš 1964: 73; Kobyljans'kyj 1964: 77; Stril'civ 1963: 68; Masjukevyc 1963: 73), to resolve the hiatus in the word *проект* 'project' by writing instead *проект* (Stril'civ 1963: 69) etc. There appeared once more proposals (Krot' 1964: 75-76; Slyn'ko 1963: 69-70) to codify the declensional and derivational models of numerals from 50 to 80 (in Gen., Dat., Loc. cases) of the type *п'ятидесяти* 'Gen., Dat., Loc. for fifty', *п'ятидесятий* 'the fiftieth' proper to Russian (but by that time also current in colloquial Ukrainian).

The discussion also concerned the graphic system. A number of authors insisted on bringing back the letter ⟨r⟩ both in Ukrainian words and in loanwords (Doboš 1964: 73; Kobyljans'kyj 1964: 76-77; Moskalenko 1963: 77; 1968: 15-16; Stril'civ 1963: 68). The linguist from the University of Odessa Artem Moskalenko (1901-1980; 1963: 78; 1968: 16) proposed to introduce special graphemes for the phonemes /dʒ/ and /dʒ/ instead of the digraphs ⟨дж⟩ and ⟨дз⟩. His colleague from Lviv, Bronislav Kobyljans'kyj (1896-1986; 1963: 77) supported this idea and suggested that such graphemes could be taken from the phonetic transcription. Generally speaking, the public demanded a cardinal spelling reform (Kulyk 1962: 3; Hulak 1963: 71; Masjukevyc 1963: 73; Kobyljans'kyj 1964: 77).

This discussion lasted for over a year and was concluded in 1964 with a paper by the head of the spelling committee Rusaniv's'kyj (1964: 271-279), entitled *Not a Reform but a Rectification*. In reality, neither a 'reform' nor a 'rectification' was carried out in the Ukrainian spelling till the late 1980s – a heated discussion resulted in a 'non-reform'. Chruščev's Thaw was an opportunity to express various views and propositions, but all the steam went into the whistle.

4. *Fragmentary Reinstatement of the Older Spelling Practice*

In 1980 the Institute of Linguistics published a collaborative volume under the title *Difficult Issues in the Current Ukrainian Spelling*. The authors dealt with some problems that had been articulated in the early 1960s, like the transcribing of the German diphthongs /ai/ and /oi/, the letter ⟨r⟩, the rendering of foreign ⟨i⟩ after dentals with ⟨и⟩ in place-names etc. (Rusaniv's'kyj 1980: 63-69, 77, 82, 110-111).

Michail Gorbačev's course on democratization made it possible to grant Ukrainian an official status in the Soviet Ukraine in November 1989. Concurrently the Ukrainian linguists were preparing the third edition of the spelling rules, which were again a matter of open discussion. The new spelling rules came out in 1990. They reintroduced some of the authentic Ukrainian features: namely the letter ⟨r⟩ reappeared in the Ukrainian alphabet, though exclusively in the Ukrainian words (УР90: 20) and in a single recent loanword *зигзаг* 'zigzag' (*ibid.*: 106). Some German proper names "of recent origin" with the diphthongs /ai/ and /oi/ were supposed to be transcribed, e.g., *Нортгайм* 'Northeim', *Нойбауер* 'Neubauer' (*ibid.*: 108); some geographical names since 1990 have the letter ⟨i⟩ changed to ⟨и⟩, e.g., *Бразилія* 'Brazil', *Братислава* 'Bratislava', *Сицилія* 'Sicily', *Чикаго* 'Chicago' (*ibid.*: 106-107). All these partial amendments were only another 'half-reform'.

5. *Conclusions*

Fluctuations in the Communists Party's general line either toward liberalization or toward oppression in its nationality and language policy unavoidably provoked revisions of the Ukrainian spelling, which either gravitated to the authentic Ukrainian tradition, or rather to what Standard Russian dictated. These fluctuations made themselves felt in the standardization principles applied in each case:

1921	Codification of the most common (Eastern) Ukrainian spelling practice;
1928	Pursuit of all-national unity;
1933-1936	Convergence with Russian, 1 st stage;
1938-1940	Convergence with Russian, 2 nd stage (unaccomplished);
1945	Compromise between the Ukrainian and Russian language systems;
1960	Convergence with Russian, 3 rd stage;
1962-1964	Simplification and fragmentary reinstatement of the older spelling practice (failed);
1990	Fragmentary reinstatement of the older spelling practice.

Since 1991, when Ukraine became independent, the language policy, especially in corpus planning, has been indeterminate. The spelling issues continue to be in the hands of the Academy of Sciences which has not liberated itself from the Soviet approaches. The efforts to reform the Ukrainian spelling after 1991 were all unproductive, and the official spelling

in force is still based mainly on the criteria and norms of 1945. However, due to the inefficient language policy, the living usage shows a tendency to disregard the official prescriptions and to re-establish the traditional spelling habits codified in the 1920s: it is becoming not unusual to read or to write, e.g., *ГемінГВей* and *ПортуГалія* instead of *ХемінГуей* and *Португалія* inherited from the Soviet period.

Abbreviations

- Hramotnist'*: *Hramotnist'* – *dzerkalo školy*, “Radians’ka osvita”, 1963, 7 (Sičen, 26), p. 1.
- Liubyty*: *Liubyty, znaty, pestyty ridnu movu*, “Radians’ka osvita”, 1962, 99 (Hruden, 15), p. 3.
- NA21a: *Najholovniši pravyla ukrajins’koho pravopysu*, Kyjiv 1921.
- NA21b: *Najholovniši pravyla ukrajins’koho pravopysu. Peredruk z Kyjivs’koho vydannia 1921 roku*. Rivne na Volyni 1921.
- NA22a: *Najholovniši pravyla ukrajins’koho pravopysu. Peredruk z Kyjivs’koho vydannia 1921 roku*, Stanyslaviv-Kolomyja 1922.
- NA22b: *Ukrajins’ka literaturna mova j pravopys*, I. *Ukrajins’ka Akademija Nauk. Najholovnišči pravyla ukrajins’koho pravopysu*, II. E. Čykalenko, *Pro ukrajins’ku literaturnu movu*, Berlin 1922.
- NA25: *Najholovniši pravyla ukrajins’koho pravopysu*, Praha 1925.
- Ot redakcii*: *Ot redakcii*, “Russkij jazyk v škole”, 1962, 4, p. 100.
- Pidsumky*: *Pidsumky narady po obhovoreniiu probram i pidručnykiv z movy ta literatury v serednij školi. Mova*, “Komunistyčna osvita”, 1938, 1, pp. 97-107.
- PROP: *Pravila russkoj orfografii i punktuacii*, Moskva 1956.
- Pro perevydannia*: *Pro perevydannia “Ukrajins’koho pravopysu” 1946 r.*, “Ukrajins’ka mova v školi”, 1957, 2, pp. 6-7.
- UP28: *Ukrajins’kyj pravopys*, Charkiv 1928.
- UP33: *Ukrajins’kyj pravopys*, Charkiv 1933.
- UP34: *Ukrajins’kyj pravopys. Druhe vydannia*, Charkiv-Kyjiv 1934.
- UP36: *Ukrajins’kyj pravopys. Tretie vydannia*, Kyjiv 1936.
- UP45: *Ukrajins’kyj pravopys*, Kyjiv 1945.
- UP60: *Ukrajins’kyj pravopys. Vydannia druhe, vypravlene i dopovnene*, Kyjiv 1960.
- UP90: *Ukrajins’kyj pravopys. 3-tie vydannia, vypravlene j dopovnene*, Kyjiv 1990.
- UPP26: *Ukrajins’kyj pravopys (Projekt)*, Charkiv 1926.

- UPP38: *Ukrajins'kyj pravopys (proekt vydannia četvertoho)*, Kyjiv 1938.
- UPP39.1: *Ukrajins'kyj pravopys*, Kyjiv 1939, pp. 138.
- UPP39.2: *Ukrajins'kyj pravopys. Vydannia četverte*, Kyjiv 1939, pp. 138.
- UPP39.3: *Ukrajins'kyj pravopys*, Kyjiv 1939, pp. 142.
- UPP40: *Ukrajins'kyj pravopys*, Kyjiv 1940.

Literature

- Andruščenko 1963: V. Andruščenko, *Vynen ne odyv pravopys*, "Radians'ka osvita", 1963, 3 (Sičen, 12), p. 3.
- Bezkrornyj et al. 1938: O. Bezkrornyj, I. Hubarževs'kyj, P. Lysenko, *Do proektu zmin v ukrajins'komu pravopysu*, "Komunistyčna osvita", 1938, 5, pp. 46-63.
- Bojarčuk 1989: O. Bojarčuk, *Peredostannja sproba*, "Pamjatky Ukrainy", 1989, 3, p. 19.
- Bulachovs'kyj 1945: L.A. Bulachovs'kyj, *Nove vydannia "Ukrajins'koho pravopysu"*, "Radians'ka škola", 1945, 4, pp. 20-24.
- Chvylja 1933: A. Chvylja, *Znyščyty korinnja ukrajins'koho nacionalizmu na movno-mu fronti (Zbirka)*, Charkiv 1933.
- Crisp 1990: S. Crisp, *Soviet Language Planning 1917-53*, in: M. Kirkwood (ed.) *Language Planning in the Soviet Union*, New York 1990, pp. 23-45.
- Doboš 1964: V.I. Doboš, *Uvahy do pravopysu*, "Ukrajins'ka mova i literatura v školi", 1964, 1, pp. 73-75.
- Hruševs'kyj 1925: M. Hruševs'kyj, *Do upravyl'nennia ukrajins'koho pravopysu*, "Ukraina", 1925, 5, pp. 189-191.
- Hulak 1963: L.I. Hulak, *Moji propozyciji*, "Ukrajins'ka mova i literatura v školi", 1963, 5, p. 71.
- Il'jin 1946: V. Il'jin, *Novyj ukrajins'kyj pravopys*, "Literaturna hazeta", 1946, 48 (Lystopad, 27), p. 4.
- Jefimenko 2002: H. Jefimenko, *Stavlennia vladnych struktur do rozvytku nacional'nych mov u Radians'kij Ukraini 1930-ch rokov*, in: V. Radčuk (ed.), *Movni konflikty i harmonizacija suspil'stva. Materialy naukovoji konferenciji 28-29 travnia 2001 roku*, Kyjiv 2002, pp. 179-185.
- Johansen 1923: M. Johansen, *Prystosuvannia latynyci do potreb ukrajins'koji movy*, "Červonyj Šljach", 9, 1923, pp. 167-169.
- Karpova 1960: V.L. Karpova, *Z istoriji ukrajins'koho pravopysu v Halyčyni (1917-1939 rr.)*, in: I.P. Krypjakevyč (ed.), *Doslidžennia i materialy z ukrajins'koji movy*, II, Kyjiv 1960, pp. 124-142.
- Kobyljans'kyj 1964: B.V. Kobyljans'kyj, *Sproščennia, a ne sproščenstvo*, "Ukrajins'ka mova i literatura v školi", 1964, 1, pp. 76-77.

- Kovalenko 1963: N. Kovalenko, *Hramatyka – šče ne mova*, “Radians’ka osvita”, 1963, 5 (Sičen’ 19), 1963, p. 3.
- Krot’ 1964: D.T. Krot’, *Žyttieva neobchidnist’ udoskonalennia*, “Ukrajins’ka mova i literatura v školi”, 1964, 1, pp. 75-76.
- Kulyk 1962: B. Kulyk, *Ne pivzachody, a korinna reforma*, “Radians’ka osvita”, 1962, 100 (Hruden’ 19), p. 3.
- Kyryčenko 1947: I.M. Kyryčenko, *Osoblyvosti novoho ukrajins’koho pravopysu*, Kyjiv 1947.
- Levčenko 1946: S. Levčenko, *Nove vydannia “Ukrajins’koho pravopysu”*, “Vitčyzna”, 1946, 10-11, pp. 193-202.
- Masjukevych 1963: O.M. Masjukevych, *Neobchidna hruntovna reforma!* “Ukrajins’ka mova i literatura v školi”, 1963, 3, pp. 70-73.
- Moser 2016: M. Moser, *New Contributions to the History of the Ukrainian Language*, Edmonton-Toronto 2016.
- Moskalenko 1963: A.A. Moskalenko, *Dumky pro sučasnyj pravopys*, “Ukrajins’ka mova i literatura v školi”, 1963, 2, pp. 77-79.
- Moskalenko 1968: A.A. Moskalenko, *Istorija ukrajins’koho pravopysu (Radians’kyj period)*, Odesa 1968.
- Nakonečnyj 1928: M. Nakonečnyj, *Pro novyj pravopys ukrajins’kyj*, Charkiv 1928.
- Nakonečnyj 1939: M.F. Nakonečnyj, *Aktual’ni pytannia ukrajins’koho pravopysu*, “Naučnyje zapiski Char’kovskogo gosudarstvennogo pedagogičeskogo instituta inostrannykh jazykov”, 1, 1939, pp. 83-108.
- Nimčuk 1991: V.V. Nimčuk, *Pro hrafiku ta pravopys jak element etničnoji kul’tury: istorija r*, “Movoznavstvo”, 1991, 3, pp. 12-21.
- Nimčuk 2002: V.V. Nimčuk, *Problemy ukrajins’koho pravopysu XX-počatku XXI st.*, Kamjanec’-Podil’s’kyj 2002.
- Onyščenko 2007: O.S. Onyščenko (ed.), *Istorija Nacional’noji akademiji nauk Ukrainy 1941-1945*, 11, Kyjiv 2007.
- Pelipas 1940: Ju. Pelipas, *Pro dejaki pytannia ukrajins’koho pravopysu*, “Komunistyčna osvita”, 1940, 11, pp. 34-45.
- Pliušč 1967: P.P. Pliušč, *Ustalennia pravopysnych norm ukrajins’koho literaturnoji movy pislia Žovtnia*, “Visnyk Kyjivs’koho universytetu. Serija fililohiji”, 1967, 9, pp. 18-26.
- Pylypenko 1923: S. Pylypenko, *Odvertyj lyst do vsix, xto cikavyt’sja cijeju spravouju*, “Čer-vonyj Šljach”, 1923, 6-7, pp. 267-268.
- Rusaniv’s’kyj 1964: V.M. Rusaniv’s’kyj, *Ne reforma, a udoskonalennia*, in: I.K. Bilodid et al. (eds.), *Pro kul’turu movy*, Kyjiv 1964, pp. 271-279.
- Rusaniv’s’kyj 1967: V.M. Rusaniv’s’kyj, *Stanovlennia i rozvytok systemy pravopysu*, in: J.A. Bahmut et al. (eds.), *Movoznavstvo na Ukraini za pjatdesiat rokov*, Kyjiv 1967, pp. 128-144.

- Rusanivs'kyj 1980: V.M. Rusanivs'kyj (ed.), *Skladni pytannia sučasnoho ukrajins'koho pravopysu*, Kyjiv 1980.
- Savyc'kyj 1926: P. Savyc'kyj, *Do reformy ukrajins'koho pravopysu (diskysija)*, "Ukrajina", 1926, 1, pp. 180-181.
- Šerech 1952: Ju. Šerech, *Pryncypy j etapy bolševyc'koho movnoji polityky na Ukrajinі*, "Sučasna Ukrajina", 1952, 14 (Červen', 29), pp. 9-10; 15 (Lypen', 13), pp. 5-6; 16 (Lypen', 27), pp. 7-8.
- Shevelov 1989: G.Y. Shevelov, *The Ukrainian Language in the First Half of the Twentieth Century (1900-1940). Its State and Status*, Cambridge (MA) 1989.
- Shevelov 1994: G.Y. Shevelov, *Tours and Detours of the Ukrainian Official Spelling* [Typescript 1994], Columbia University Library. George Y. Shevelov Archival Collection, box 21, folder 8, pp. 1-16.
- Simovyč 2005: V. Simovyč, *Praci v dvoch tomach*, 1. *Movoznavstvo*, Černivci 2005.
- Slyn'ko 1963: I.I. Slyn'ko, *Nablyzty pravopys do potreb školy*, "Ukrajins'ka mova i literatura v školi", 1963, 3, pp. 67-70.
- Smal'-Stoc'kyj 1926: S. Smal'-Stoc'kyj, *Pravopysna sprava*, "Ukrajina", 1926, 4, pp. 180-191.
- Smal'-Stoc'kyj 1936: R. Smal'-Stoc'kyj, *Ukrajins'ka mova v Soviets'kij Ukrajinі*, Varšava 1936.
- Stril'civ 1963: P.S. Stril'civ, *Sproščenyj pravopys – krašča hramotnist'*, "Ukrajins'ka mova i literatura v školi", 1963, 5, pp. 66-69.
- Šumlians'kyj 1927: F. Šumlians'kyj, *Najholovniši pravyla ukrajins'koho pravopysu Ukrajin'skoho Akademiji Nauk vydannia 1921 roku. Rozvidka*, Cherson 1927.
- Syniavs'kyj 1931: O. Syniavs'kyj, *Korotka istorija "Ukrajins'koho pravopysu"*, in: *Kul'tura ukrajins'koho slova. Zbirnyk Naukovo-Doslidčoho Instytutu T. Ševčenko*, 1, 1931, pp. 93-112.
- Tel'niuk 1989: S. Tel'niuk, *Narkom URSR P.H. Tyčyna: u ti najvažči roky...*, "Radians'ka osvita", 1989, 3 (Sičen', 10), p. 4.
- Tkačuk 1924: I. Tkačuk, *Nevidkladne zavdannia (do spravy zavedennia latyn'skoho alfavitu v ukrajins'kim pys'mi)*, "Červonij Šljach", 1924, 4-5, pp. 245-247.
- Tymčenko 1925: Je. Tymčenko, *Desiderata v spravi našoho pravopysu*, "Ukrajina", 1925, 4, pp. 188-191.
- Tymošenko 1967: P.D. Tymošenko, *Ukrajins'ke movoznavstvo v Kyjiv'skomu universyteti za roky radians'koho vlady*, "Visnyk Kyjiv'skoho universytetu. Serija filolohiji", 1967, 9, pp. 3-10.
- Vakulenko 2009: S. Vakulenko, *1933-ij rik v istoriji ukrajins'koho movy: čynna norma ta pravopysna praktyka (na prykladi redakcijnymi polityky hazety "Komunist")*, "Vyvčajemo ukrajins'ku movu ta literaturu", 2009, 16-18, pp. 74-79.

- Varčenko 1959: I. Varčenko, *Pytannia pravopysu – zahal'nonarodna sprava*, "Literaturna hazeta", 18 (Berezen', 6), 1959, p. 2.
- Vološčuk *et al.* 1962: Ja. Vološčuk, M. Kozyr, M. Novakivs'ka, H. Tymošenko, Je. Šuhnylo, I. Jacenko, V. Cvilichivs'kyj, *Liubty, znaty, pestyty ridnu movu. Vidkrytyj lyst [do] Instytutu movoznavstva Akademiji nauk URSR*, "Radians'ka osvita", 1962, 96 (Hruden', 5), p. 1.
- Zahrods'kyj 1941: A. Zahrods'kyj, *Kil'ka uvah do proektu ukrajins'koho pravopysu*, "Komunistyčna osvita", 1941, 3, pp. 119-123.
- Žovtobrjuch 1939: M. Žovtobrjuch, *Novi pidručnyky ukrajins'koho movy*, "Komunistyčna osvita", 1939, 1, pp. 136-142.
- Žovtobrjuch 1991: M. Žovtobrjuch, *Narys istoriji ukrajins'koho radians'koho movoznavstva*, Kyjiv 1991.

Abstract

Kateryna Karunyk

The Ukrainian Spelling Reforms, Half-Reforms, Non-Reforms and Anti-Reforms as Manifestation of the Soviet Language Policy

Standardisation of the Ukrainian language during the Soviet period passed through a number of fluctuations which had their impact on the language structure, including the spelling.

In 1921 the first state-supported spelling rules appeared in Soviet Ukraine, which were based on the language usage of the Eastern part of the country. By contrast the spelling reform of 1928 aimed at unifying the speaking and writing habits of both Easterners and Westerners. When the Soviet authorities assumed an oppressive attitude towards non-Russian peoples at the turn of the 1930s, the official spelling was rejected as "nationalistic" and pro-Polish. Instead, in the anti-reform of 1933, Ukrainian spelling was brought as close as possible to the Russian one (by the same token, it clashed with the internal structure of the language). Thus it required further revision and the spelling discussions of 1938-1945 finally reached a quasi-compromise between the two previous codes, which resulted in a "half-reform". In the 1960s, another discussion followed, but had no practical results (a non-reform). Finally, in 1990 another half-reform reintroduced some of the authentic Ukrainian elements in the new version of the spelling.

Keywords

Ukrainian Spelling Rules; Language Standardisation; Soviet Language Planning.